



April 22, 2002

Ms. J. Middlebrooks
Assistant City Attorney
City of Dallas
2014 Main, Room 501
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2002-2025

Dear Ms. Middlebrooks:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 161650.

The City of Dallas (the "city") received a request for any arrest or offense reports pertaining to a named individual. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we must address the city's obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code. Subsections 552.301(a) and (b) provide:

(a) A governmental body that receives a written request for information that it wishes to withhold from public disclosure and that it considers to be within one of the [act's] exceptions . . . must ask for a decision from the attorney general about whether the information is within that exception if there has not been a previous determination about whether the information falls within one of the exceptions.

(b) The governmental body must ask for the attorney general's decision and state the exceptions that apply within a reasonable time but not later than the 10th business day after the date of receiving the written request.

You indicate that the city received this request for information on January 28, 2002. You transmitted your request for a decision from this office on February 17, 2002. Consequently, you failed to request a decision within the ten business day period mandated by section 552.301(a) of the Government Code. Because the request for a decision was not timely submitted, the requested information is presumed to be public information. Gov't Code § 552.302.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302; *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.--Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.302); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). Section 552.101 provides a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness. *See* Open Records Decision No. 630 (1994) (presumption of openness overcome by a showing that the information is made confidential by another source of law or affects third party interests). We will therefore address your arguments under section 552.101.

Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." For information to be protected from public disclosure by the common-law right of privacy under section 552.101, the information must meet the criteria set out in *Industrial Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). In *Industrial Foundation*, the Texas Supreme Court stated that information is excepted from disclosure if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the release of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. 540 S.W.2d at 685. Where an individual's criminal history information has been compiled by a governmental entity, the information takes on a character that implicates the individual's right to privacy. *See United States Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749 (1989). In this instance, the requestor asks for all information concerning a certain person. In this case, we believe that the individual's right to privacy has been implicated. Thus, where the named individual is a possible suspect, we determine that this information is made confidential under common-law privacy as encompassed by section 552.101 of the Government Code. *See id.*

We note, however, that the request for information submitted to the city is not from a member of the public but from another governmental entity. We ruled in Open Records Decision No. 661 (1999) that whether a governmental entity may release information to another governmental entity is not a question under the Public Information Act (the "Act") as the Act is concerned with the required release of information to the *public*. Gov't Code §§ 552.001, .002, .021; *see* Attorney General Opinions, H-683 (1975), H-242 (1974), M-713 (1970); Open Records Decision No. 655 (1997). For many years, this office has recognized that it is the public policy of this state that governmental bodies should cooperate with each other in the interest of the efficient and economical administration of statutory duties. *See, e. g.*, Attorney General Opinion H-836 (1976); Open Records Decision No. 655 (1997). *But see* Attorney General Opinions DM-353 at 4 n. 6 (1995). Consequently, confidential information may be "transferred between state agencies without violating its confidential character on the basis of a recognized need to maintain an unrestricted flow of information

between state agencies.” Attorney General Opinion H-683 at 4; *see* ORD 677. We therefore conclude that the city has the discretion to release the requested information to the requestor. Should the city decline to exercise that discretion, the city must withhold the information under section 552.101 in conjunction with the common-law right to privacy.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov’t Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body’s intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general’s Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at 512/475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'DRS', with a stylized flourish at the end.

David R. Saldivar
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DRS/sdk

Ref: ID# 161650

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Ms. Brooke Grier
Child Protective Services Specialist III
Texas Department of Protective and Regulatory Services
3303 Mineola Highway
Tyler, Texas 75702
(w/o enclosures)